



Cover: "War [after Guernica by Pablo Picasso]" (2012)

oil/alkyd oil on canvas

2130mmx1210mm

Artist: Robyn Kahukiwa

Fightback

a pamphlet *Struggle, Solidarity, Socialism*



Socialism and Māori Sovereignty

\$10

Published by Fightback 2016

Edited by Bronwen Beechey, Grant Brookes and Ian Anderson

Layout by Daphne Lawless and Joel Cosgrove

Table of Contents

Obituary: Mike Kyriazopoulos *p4*

Marxism and the Māori Sovereignty
Movement - a Māori communist
perspective *p6*
by Huriana Kopeke-Te Aho

Book Review: Encircled Lands: Te
Urewera, 1820 – 1921 *p11*
by Mike Kyriazopoulos

The Treaty, The Foreshore and Seabed,
and Tino Rangatiratanga *p21*
by Mike Kyriazopoulos

Tino Rangatiratanga - What's it got to
do with Pākehā? *p34*
by Grant Brookes

Ae Marika: Tribute to Mike
Kyriazopoulos *p56*
by Hone Harawira

Obituary: Mike Kyriazopoulos

*By Jared Phillips. Originally posted on the **Fightback** website, 21 February 2014.*

Last month Fightback lost one of its leading members, Michael Kyriazopoulos. In Aotearoa he was known in the workers movement as Mike Kay. Mike came to us from England but he had a strong Greek heritage, and had close family living in both Israel and South Africa. So he had a very broad culture. Tragically, Mike was diagnosed with motor neurone disease in January 2013.

He brought a lot to Fightback. His international knowledge, his knowledge of issues within Marxism, and his measured consistent approach to practice meant that he was a leading member of the organisation.

At Mike's funeral a tribute by one of Mike's Alliance for Workers Liberty comrades in the UK was read. It pointed out that Mike was 'comfortable leading from the middle'. This was a great way

to put it; in our view Mike led really well but he never sought to be out at the front and never got in the way of the political growth of others whom he had developed.

His industrial work in the UK was in the rank-and-file of the posties union. In Aotearoa he worked as an organiser for Northern AWUNZ. His finest moment was during the struggle of I-Kiribati workers against redundancies and to establish union rights with an agricultural employer. He turned this in to a political struggle by involving his local Mana Party branch and Mana leaders. He also led a case for reinstatement and was successful. This had lasting importance in terms of case law, as the government had recently changed reinstatement laws, so they were up for interpretation.

At a different workplace a discussion has just been started about a members' education scholarship being made under his name. Of course he supported

workers in many other struggles being waged by other unions.

Theoretically, Mike's main contributions were on the issue of the relationship between Maori liberation and socialism. He has asked us all, particularly in the Mana movement and in the socialist left, to keep pushing on this question. Fightback has endorsed the idea of compiling some of his work on these issues in to pamphlet form. Some people are surprised that this was an area where Mike focussed a lot of his theoretical work. But it makes sense. He was able to come at the question with less predetermination than others and with the sharp clarity for which he was known.

Mike and his wife Jo became citizens of Aotearoa in the first half of 2013 and Mike swore his citizenship oath in the presence of Hone Harawira. Mike rebelliously followed that with a

commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi. Hone threw one of his tongue-in-cheek jokes by noting "and he'll be one of the first people we've welcomed in to the country!"

Amongst all his friends – activists and non-activists – Mike was also inspirational because of the way he was during his illness and because of his accomplishments when he was sick. This included continuing to pay socialist membership dues, writing and publishing his grandmother's memoirs of the Russian Revolution, and of course publishing his fiction piece *A Cloudy Sunday*. We thank him for leaving us with *A Cloudy Sunday* which provides many insights into his views and thoughts on life.

We will miss him dearly as a comrade. Many of us will also miss him as a friend. We'll never forget him, his contribution, or the work he has asked us to continue.

Marxism and the Māori Sovereignty Movement - a Māori communist perspective

*Article by Huriana Kopeke-Te Aho, originally printed in **Fightback** magazine's 2015 Women and Gender Minorities issue.*

The influence of Marxist theory and particularly Marx's theory of alienation and capitalist political economy on the Māori sovereignty movement during the 1970's is important to examine, and I would also like to consider the contemporary relevance of these ideas for Tino Rangatiratanga (Māori political autonomy). Marx clarifies the exploitative relationship underpinning the political and economic system of capitalism. The themes of subjugation, oppression and enslavement that are necessary within a capitalist political economy are common to the process of colonisation and the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised, and indeed still feature in the contemporary neo-colonial struggle. The arms of colonisation reach backwards and forwards in time, creating a struggle that we as Māori are born into. Our destiny and our legacy is one of resistance rather than acceptance and passive submission.

Capitalism relies on the exploitation of labour, this then leads to alienation. Marx's theory of alienation is anchored in the positioning of human beings as conscious creative beings. Marx called this uniquely human capacity for creation 'species-being'. Marx distinguished us from other living beings by our ability to perform 'conscious' labour. Through the act of change and transformation of our environment we change ourselves in the process. In Marx's theory, capitalism creates and relies upon the construct of alienation. Furthermore, the invention of social class, which flourishes under capitalism, relies on the creation of a working class and a ruling class – the bourgeoisie who own the means of production, and the proletariat who create profit for the bourgeoisie through their labour. In this economic process, the worker is dehumanised, so much so that they become little more than a means of production, a unit of labour to be bought and sold as capital.

Marx further separated the construct of alienation into four key concepts that



MANA post-election hui, 2014

together, made a unified theory of labour exploitation. In the process of alienation the worker becomes, firstly, alienated from his fellow workers/social relations, being subverted into a singular unit of production. Secondly, the individual becomes alienated from the process of creative labour through the commodification of the outcomes of their labour and themselves in the process of creating for another. Thirdly, the individual becomes alienated from the product of their labour as they no longer own their own creativity or the

product of their work, and lastly, they become alienated from their own essential nature or “species essence” (Seeman, 1975).

However, it is important not to conceptualise exploitation as merely an unjust part of the capitalist system. In point of fact, subjugation and the class struggle are an integral and vitally important component of the capitalist system. The class struggle is an intrinsic and permanent feature of the political economy of capitalism, as is the use of the police and judiciary to enforce this system against resistance from

the exploited. Colonisation itself is built on a racist oppressive relationship that produces the alienation of indigenous peoples from themselves. The realities of colonisation and the colonial legacy, which traverses generations producing contemporary impacts in the form of pervasive inequities and inequalities, has fuelled and continues to fuel indigenous political activism (Fanon, 1965; Walker, 1989). Memmi (1965) asserts that on realising their oppressed state, the colonised have two choices - rebellion or assimilation. Assimilation requires the absolute rejection and denial of themselves, their indigenous value systems, worldviews and lifeways. In order to assimilate, the colonised must enter in a willing state of self-loathing, despising everything about themselves that hinders their conversion into and emulation of, the model of the 'coloniser'. Fanon (1965) maintains that after failed attempts to be like the coloniser, the only recourse for the colonised upon fully realising that they will never be acceptable to the coloniser is rebellion. In Fanon's analysis, rebellion is inevitable as it is in a Marxist analysis. Marx's theory of historical materialism further informs the indigenous struggles against the artefacts of colonisation. In a contemporary analysis, the litany of theft and dispossession of land and resources throughout the indigenous

world, ignites the fire of resistance and struggle with the goal being the reclaiming of the power and authority to be self-determining (Alfred, 2005; Churchill, 2002).

An extension on the scholarship of Alfred and Churchill is offered by Rata (2006) who conducts an analysis of the construction of indigenous tribal elites which can be likened to a brown bourgeoisie. In Rata's analysis, the resistance to tribal domination constructs a new struggle which can be understood through Marx's theory of alienation; only this time, the struggle is to be freed from alienation from within the tribal culture and collective (Rata, 2009). This is the internalisation and application of the role of the coloniser to further disempower the colonised. More recent applications of the struggle for self-determination place this struggle at once as a reassertion of indigenous rights as well as a shifting of the fight towards increasingly powerful Māori tribal leadership. The enemy is identified as one that which resides 'within'. It is however important to recall the process of colonisation and the development of historical intergenerational trauma which still winds its way through the lives of indigenous peoples today, creating a vulnerability that causes blindness to the real source of the struggle. In this new struggle, the capacity to hold on to

the underpinning role of colonisation in the dispossession of Māori should never be lost sight of or the potency of the struggle underestimated (Churchill, 2003).

In his book *Kā Whāwhai Tonu Mātou*, Walker examines the ongoing resistance of Māori to colonisation. The resistance movement took as a component of its early inspiration, Marxist theories including alienation and the exploitation of the 'worker' for the benefit of the 'owner' under capitalism. Marx provided our predecessors in the resistance movement with a way of understanding the impacts of capitalist expansionism which was a characteristic of colonisation, on the contemporary position of Māori. The resistance to colonisation is an ongoing struggle as potent for many today as it was when the first colonisers set foot on Aotearoa in 1769.

However, much has changed in the way in which our struggle takes place today. Iwi have become the new elites (Rata 1997) and what was once a clear struggle between coloniser and colonised, has become further complicated with the coloniser having a brown face as the economics of Treaty settlements give them license to look and act like capitalists and crown agents. The illusion that we are subscribing to is that by adopting

capitalism as our *modus operandi* in the long march towards self-determination, we can secure freedom for generations to come, changing the system from within. Have we forgotten that capitalism, with the attendant greed for land and resources, fuelled colonisation? And now that many iwi have signed 'full and final' treaty settlements, the danger is that hard-won resources will not last and future generations will be left with nothing. Capitalism is one of the tools of colonisation and while our ancestors were highly successful entrepreneurs, we were a collective society, whose actions were based on what was best for the collective iwi, hapu and whanau. It was always with the collective good at the center of the uptake of new technology and ways of trading.

The contribution Marxist theory makes to indigenous struggles for freedom is rooted in Marxist discourse on historical materialism (Hokowhitu, 2010) and the ongoing contemporary effects of historically established economic and political systems which continue to feed inequities in all aspects of Māori lives today (Reid & Robson, 2007). It is the inevitability of the struggle for freedom from the shackles of the powerful that render Marx's theory so powerful in indigenous human rights movements around the world.



Encircled Lands

Judith Binney

Te Urewera, 1820–1921



Book Review: Encircled Lands: Te Urewera, 1820 – 1921

Book author: Judith Binney

Publisher: Bridget Williams Books

Release year: 2009

Review by Mike Kyriazopoulos, originally published by Fightback in September 2010.

One of New Zealand's leading contemporary historians, Judith Binney, has written a major study on the story of how the people of the Urewera came to be parted from their lands. This book deserves to be widely read. However, at over 600 pages long, it is unlikely to reach the audience that it merits. Therefore, I will attempt to summarise the narrative in this review, and then analyse it from a Marxist perspective.

Hapū of the Urewera take their name from Tūhoe-pōtiki, who was descended from the immigrant Toroa, leader of the Mataatua waka, and also the indigenous ancestors Toi and Pōtiki I.

While the Urewera has always been the Tūhoe heartlands, other areas have been contested with other tribes. The fertile alluvial plains of Opouriao were conquered by Tūhoe in the 1820s who defeated the coastal people of Ngāti Raka,

and saw off Ngāpuhi who had come to expel them. The inaccessibility of the Urewera gave rise to many European prejudices about its people:

The colonial myth of Empire – an assumed right to authoritative control by Europeans – turned Te Urewera into New Zealand's "Heart of Darkness". The land was primordial and menacing, not able to be easily ordered by an axe, and its people "primitive". They were considered to be, in the 1860s, the final bastion of an entrenched mana Māori, because they defended their land until they were physically removed from their dangerous mountains into temporary "concentration camps" or, in some instances, into permanent exile. The government insisted that the Urewera had to be subjugated. There was, thus, a direct political relationship imagined between the people and the concealing landscape. That this remains a recurrent mental association has been demonstrated by the armed police invasion of Ruatoki in 2007. (pp. 30-31)



Tukaroto Matutaera Potatau Te Wherowhero Tawhiao, the second Māori King

Musket-armed Ngāpuhi attacked Tūhoe about 1822, causing everyone to flee inland to Maungapohatu. In 1829, Tūhoe leader Paora Kīngi I forged a peace between Maatutua tribes. Trade and the arrival of missionaries began to rapidly transform life in the Urewera. Contact with traders brought pigs, corn and potatoes from Auckland's markets. Missionaries brought literacy. "Māori Christianity was extensively self-taught in the Urewera." (p.52) There was great competition between Protestant and Catholic missionaries. The latter were more successful with their ornate rituals, icons and political neutrality in a British

colony. Increasingly, Tūhoe were seeking paid work, mainly in government road building, since they needed money to acquire metal tools, cooking pots and cutting instruments. By the early 1840s Tūhoe had reoccupied the Waimana and Ruatoki river valleys.

In 1856, Tūhoe attended an intertribal gathering at Pukawa to discuss Māori "kingship", but did not join the Kīngitanga until two years later under the leadership of Potatau. Governor George Grey's representative visited the Urewera in 1862 with a proposal for "rūnanga" – self-governing Māori district

councils with powers to determine land titles, partly intended to undermine the King Movement. The initiative was cautiously welcomed by Tūhoe, but it was never tested, since the Native Land Court (a roving tribunal) was set up instead.

In 1862 the Waikato chief Rewi Maniapoto visited Ruatahuna, seeking military support. After some debate, a contingent of about 50 Tūhoe was sent. They fought in the siege of Orakau in 1864, the final battle of the Waikato War. The pā was outnumbered four to one by government forces. Nevertheless they resisted five assaults and 56 hours of continuous fighting. About 30 Tūhoe were killed with the remainder escaping in the subsequent orchestrated breakout. Later, Tūhoe came to interpret the decision to make distant war as a disaster. But they had decided to send a small contingent because “[t]hey feared (correctly) that their lands might be next to come under threat of government invasion.” (p.73)

Missionaries from Taranaki prophet Te Ua Haumene’s Pai Mārire religion arrived in 1865. Kereopa Te Rau and Patara Te Raukauri preached a doctrine of divine intervention that “offered a theology of a future liberation in a colonial situation.” (p.75) They imposed a blockade at Whakatane to prevent the

return of the Anglican missionary and government informant Carl Volkner. A rūnanga then decided to execute Volkner. Kereopa was central to the decision, but there was little evidence of Tūhoe involvement. Pai Mārire spread rapidly through the Urewera, where Kereopa found sanctuary. This led to civil war with neighbouring Ngāti Porou. Government agent Donald McLean demanded loyalty oaths from tribal chiefs, leading to further division and warfare. Another government informant, James Fulloon, was killed after provoking Pai Mārire adherents at Whakatane.

In September 1865, the government ordered a full-scale military occupation of the eastern Bay of Plenty. They looted land at Opotoki, and confiscated coastal areas of the Bay. Any resistance to the imposed martial law was considered rebellion. In January 1866, low lying land at the northern edges of the Urewera was confiscated to fund escalating war costs and to break the will of the people. “Cost recovery” continued by means of land sales. A Compensation Court was set up, charged with distinguishing between “loyalist” and “rebel” Māori. This process began the individualisation of Māori land titles, undermining hapū and tribal cohesion.

On 11 September 1866, the government gazetted a confiscation line, cutting

out a huge chunk of costal land. The boundary was both economic and punitive. Urewera chiefs agreed to surrender Kereopa. However, Binney argues that probably “the government did not wish to settle for peace terms with Tūhoe’s leaders... [they] wanted to break the autonomy of Te Urewera.” (p.111) Tūhoe declared the confiscation line an “aukati, a defensive line that none could cross with a hostile purpose without reprisal.” (p.113) Land beyond the line became the “Rohe Pōtae”, just as Maniapoto had declared in the King Country. Guerrilla warfare continued, and in January 1868 an epidemic (probably influenza) was raging. Major J. H. St John destroyed cultivations, having “learnt that starvation was his best ally in this war.” (p.130)

Within this tragic story, there is some light relief at the ineptitude of the colonial government. Its East Coast Land Titles Investigation Act of 1866 was intended to enable the “confiscation of lands belonging to those considered to be rebels. However, in the following year it was suddenly realised that the Act had been incompetently drafted: a tangle of double negatives ensured that the Act authorised the government to retain land owned by all those who were deemed not to have been in rebellion!” (p.134) It was hurriedly corrected.

In 1869, another government fugitive, Te Kooti, sought refuge in Te Urewera. The alliance he forged with Tūhoe “was the direct consequence of the government’s actions” (p.143) The overwhelming force of government troops amounted to “a war of domination, extending far beyond the search for one man.” (p.180) Tūhoe were forced to “come in” to costal areas and sell land under duress. Loss of land drove Tūhoe to support Te Kooti. But finally, Tūhoe gave their allegiance as a tribe to the government in April 1871. Even so, they showed considerable ambivalence to the on-going manhunt. In December, the Anglican missionary William Colenso published a pamphlet pleading for clemency and an end to “an unjust and unholy war.”

The first promise of autonomy for Tūhoe from the government came from a pact that Ruatahuna chief Paerou negotiated with McLean in 1871. In June 1872 Urewera hapū formed a council called “Te Whitu Tekau” (The Seventy). Their aim was to support the authority of the Rohe Pōtae. The government’s strategy of “conquest by purchase” was threatening its borders. Yet the Urewera’s Rohe Pōtae remained “substantially outside the bounds of British sovereignty”, long after its counterpart in King Country was opened up. Absolute poverty of the subsistence farming meant “[t]here was no surplus production by which

Tūhoe could develop trade.” (p.259) This increased pressure to lease land.

In 1886, Native Minister John Ballance promised a “separate district” to the Urewera. But Tūhoe were finding that the Land Court system and the costs associated with it ensured that they would lose time and again. “The survey debts imposed as liens over their lands were impossible to meet without further subdivision and sale.” In 1895, surveys were obstructed by Tūhoe, who then faced police and artillery and eventually imprisonment. Prospectors were increasingly interested in the Urewera as a possible source of gold deposits.

The Urewera District Reserve Act was passed in October 1896. Prime Minister Seddon claimed that it fulfilled McLean’s earlier promise. The Act gave the Urewera autonomy, but also gave the government a monopoly on buying land in the area. The intention was to establish the mana of the Queen, rather than the existing *de facto* autonomy. The Act also established the Urewera Commission, chaired by a Land Court judge. The Commission was charged with establishing block titles, but this led to feuding amongst the various hapū due to overlapping boundaries.

The Act led to a renewed enthusiasm for achieving autonomy amongst Tūhoe.

A symbol of this was the flag obtained by Maungapohatu chief Tutakangahau. It consisted of the Union Jack defaced with the wording “Kotahi Te Ture/ Mo Nga Iwi E Rua/ Maungapohatu” (One Law/ For Both Peoples/ Maungapohatu). The demand for radical equality is evident. This flag was subsequently seized by the police in 1916 as evidence in the charge of sedition against Rua Kenana.

In 1907 the community at Te Houhi in the western Urewera were evicted from their ancestral land, despite the private landowners obtaining their title fraudulently. The people could not afford to initiate legal proceedings. The laws favoured “one form of property ownership (European-owned, private freehold property) at the expense of Māori communally owned land.” (p.493)

Tūhoe were looking to a newly emerging leader, Rua Kenana. He claimed authority based on Te Kooti’s prophetic tradition, not whakapapa (which favoured his traditionalist rival Numia). He founded a settlement named Hiruharama Hou (New Jerusalem) at Maungapohatu in 1907. A European visitor described the community as a place of “peace and plenty” with crops, livestock and orchards. The MP for Eastern Māori, Āpirana Ngata, ensured Rua could sell land to the government to raise working capital for Hiruharama Hou.



Rua Kenana

In 1906 Tūhoe elected a General Committee in an attempt to realise self-government under the 1896 Act. But the government was preoccupied with granting prospecting licenses, which it was able to do under the 1905 Mining Act. Rua Kenana was “not so much a democrat, but a potential monarch”, who saw scriptural history and the possibility

of gold as providing for a self-sustaining, co-operatively farmed kingdom in the Urewera. Meanwhile the Liberal government faced “heavy pressure to make Māori land more productive.” (p.518)

Ngata and fellow Māori MP James Carroll set about undermining the 1896 Act in order to bring the Rohe Pōtae within the country’s general laws. New legislation gave the government a monopoly on buying land in the Urewera. Additionally, it could set its own land valuations, which in the Urewera did not include timber value.

The government had promised Tūhoe that it would build a road in the Waimana Valley, but it never did, as this would have increased the value of land held by Tūhoe. Ngata’s policy was to open up Tūhoe land to European settlement and conserve a tribal core

as papakāinga (communally owned inalienable land, i.e. reserves). Carroll began negotiating directly with Rua, undermining the General Committee. “It was the beginning of direct and illegal purchasing in the Urewera.” (p.557)

The government formally suspended purchasing in the Urewera in March 1912, by which time it had acquired some 40,000 acres. Ngata “used Rua to break open the shell of Tūhoe resistance to land sales” (p.564) This was “the direct application of the Liberals’ view that ‘idle’ lands should be removed from the hands of ‘backward’ or inept landlords, and vested with others.” (p.566) By 1915, Rua was seen as “the main obstacle” to the government’s land purchasing plans.

In April 1916, Rua was arrested by armed police in what the Supreme Court later ruled an illegal assault. Rua had been charged by police several times prior. The 1910 Licensing Act, under Ngata’s influence, had proclaimed “Native Prohibition Areas”, which included the Urewera. This Act enabled Rua’s arrest for “sly grogging” in 1915. During the trial, a constable “gave evidence that it was ‘practically impossible’ to get Māori in the district to enlist [for World War I] owing to Rua’s influence.” (p.580) He served a three month jail sentence, but this only served to increase his mana.

Binney examines the evidence of the 1916 raid and draws a number of conclusions: Rua did not resist arrest; his son was probably murdered by police; and the police probably fired the first shot. Rua was then sent to Auckland for trial. His trial was at that time the longest in New Zealand history, running to 47 days of hearings. Of the eight charges against him, the jury found him guilty of just one: “morally resisting arrest”. Yet Judge Frederick Chapman (later Chief Justice) sentenced Rua to one year’s hard labour and a further 18 month’s imprisonment. Chapman told him that the “arm of the law was long... That is the lesson that your people should learn from this trial.” (p.591) On the very same day that the sentence was delivered, the Reform government introduced legislation to retrospectively validate its previous illegal land purchases in the Urewera.

The trial had placed huge financial burdens of Tūhoe, who had to bear the substantial legal costs, and were also billed for the costs of the police expedition (amounting to over £900), meaning they were forced to sell more land. Land Court judge J.W. Brown was charged to “inspect” the distressed community at Maungapohatu with a view to government assistance. This he declined on the basis that “The Tuhoe Natives are, if anything, more



A slogan written outside the Auckland high court during the Urewera 17 trials

communistic than any other section of Natives in New Zealand.” (p.592)

Legislation of August 1916 allowed individual Māori owners in the Urewera to sell land “to the Crown, but to no other person.” (p.595) By late 1919, the government had acquired more than half of the land in the Rohe Pōtae. The consolidation process resulted in almost 68,000 acres being transferred from Tūhoe to the government, with the non-sellers being concentrated in reserves. The underlying principle of the process was described by Native Minister Gordon Coates as “the extinction of

existing titles and the substitution of another form of title which knows no more of ancestral rights to particular portions of the land.” (p.597) As Binney notes, “In Tūhoe’s case, it was the state that took their land, not individual settlers.” (p.615)

In her conclusion, Binney states that the shift in the population balance in favour of the European settlers was in the end decisive for Tūhoe. Yet the Urewera District Reserve Act of 1896 “was a unique experiment. There was – and is – no other legally recognised, self-governing tribal enclave in the country.”

(p.604) She quotes a submission to the Waitangi Tribunal in 2003 which described the encirclement of the Urewera as “New Zealand’s equivalent of the highland clearances in Scotland” (p.608)

Tūhoe found themselves trapped behind their aukati, isolated from their kaimoana and other traditional food sources. “The recurrent crop failures at the end of the nineteenth century, caused by flooding, unseasonal frosts and blight were an indication of the marginality of the lands they were trying to cultivate with new crops.” (p.609) Far from the “isolationist” stereotype of Europeans, Tūhoe had tried to develop an economic relationship with settlers, e.g. gifting land to Pākehā at Ruatoki for a store and a co-operative cheese factory.

For Tūhoe, history is still very much a living thing, emphasised by the fact that heavily armed police from the Special Tactics Group patrolled the confiscation line at Ruatoki during the so-called “anti-terror” raids of 15 October 2007.

Binney points to Nunavut, the large Inuit state on the north coast of Canada, as a model for Tūhoe self-government within the nation state. She concludes by suggesting that Tūhoe autonomy may be realised in the same way “the Treaty

of Waitangi itself has been reborn in the last thirty years at the social contract” (p.615)

For Marxists, what is decisive in the turbulent period of history examined in Binney’s book is a fundamental change in the economic mode of production. The Polynesian mode of production was marked by communal labour and land ownership. With arrival of European settlers, this system was increasingly under pressure from a new one: the Peasant mode of production, marked by subsistence agriculture, consolidated in “Māori land”. Rua’s struggle at Maungapohatu can to some extent be seen as an attempt to defend the Polynesian mode of production in unfavourable historical circumstances.

The Young Māori Party (of which Āpirana Ngata was a member) believed the future for Māori lay in their assimilation into a fully capitalist way of life. Ngata’s colleague Peter Buck wrote in 1906:

“The [Māori] communism of the past meant industry, training in arms, good physique, the sharing of the tribal burden, and the preservation of life. It was a factor in the evolution of the race. The communism of today means indolence, sloth, decay of racial vigour, the crushing

of individual effort, the spreading of introduced infectious diseases and the many evils that are petrifying the Māori and preventing his advance." (Quoted in Nunes, p. 19)

It is not hard to see how such a political outlook encouraged Ngata to assist the government in the alienation of communally owned tribal land.

But what of the idea for Tūhoe autonomy that Binney argues so stridently for throughout her book? My major concern with Binney's conclusion is her comment framing the case for self-determination against the context of the New Zealand's state's rediscovery of the Treaty of Waitangi in recent years. For us in the Workers Party, the Treaty (which Tūhoe never signed) is nothing more than legal cover for robbery and seizure of Māori tribal land. Few Māori beyond a tiny tribal elite have seen any real gains from the Treaty claims process. One would hope any form of self-government for Tūhoe would be far more democratic and equitable than anything that has come out of the Treaty tribunals!

The programme of a predecessor organisation of the Workers Party includes support for: "a high degree of autonomy for the Māori people up to and including the creation of Māori Autonomous Regions with special state financial assistance aimed at redressing past injustices." However, the fact that today Māori are overwhelmingly part of the working class, urbanised, detribalised and intermixed with non-Māori peoples, means that autonomy is impractical in most instances.

But for Tūhoe in the Urewera, they remain a compact population with many of their traditional kinship ties still in place. This, together with a longstanding yearning for self-determination (and the existence of a unique, if short-lived, historical precedent) may mean that revolutionaries need to take a fresh look at the case for autonomy in the Urewera.

Sources

Nunes, R. (1991) "The Maori in Prehistory and Today", Workers' Party of New Zealand

The Treaty, the Foreshore and Seabed and Tino Rangatiratanga

By Mike Kyriazopoulos, Fightback and MANA movement. Originally published October 2011, as a contribution to discussions within the Workers Party (a predecessor of Fightback)

The emergence of the Mana Movement has given an urgency to our drive to renew our perspective on Māori liberation. Furthermore, the departure of the Redline group has given us cause to re-examine our past positions on a number of matters, including indigenous issues. In order for us to begin that work, I have tried to reconstruct those former positions. This was far from easy, since most of the early WP [Workers Party] material is no longer available on line, and my personal involvement with the Party was fairly marginal when the Foreshore and Seabed controversy broke. The latter, along with the WP position on the Treaty of Waitangi and Tino Rangatiratanga (TR) form the three topics of this discussion document, since those were the major issues of contention between ourselves, the rest of the left, and the Māori Sovereignty movement.

I want to begin by acknowledging the specificity of Aotearoa, in that it is unique amongst imperialist countries in having a sizeable indigenous population possessing a significant social weight. This fact is important to cultural nationalists as well as Marxists: “Unlike any other indigenous colonized people, the Māori live within white culture. Not on reserves. Not in rural areas. [...] This is the Māori radicalizing potential.”[Awatere]

The Treaty

We have recently had some debate within the WP around the character of pre-European Māori society. I believe that the basic argument advanced in Ray Nunes’ pamphlet is correct – that the lack of a regular surplus in pre-European Māori society prevented the formation of class society.

In any case, Māori did not have any concept of private property in the form of land:

The Māori people [...] were not interested in the ownership or



United Tribes of New Zealand flag of the 34 independent chiefs

“possession” of land as the Treaty expressed it. Philosophically, at least, it was land that possessed the people. Land was a medium for building and maintaining relationships. Buying and selling real estate was unknown. But it was soon to become only too problematic.

In 1835, the British Resident, James Busby convened a meeting of 34 chiefs to sign a Declaration of Independence, designed to head off claims from rival imperialists.

As Europeans continued to arrive in ever greater numbers, Governor Hobson was instructed to obtain the surrender of sovereignty from the chiefs in order to enable annexation. Some chiefs opposed signing. Forty-three chiefs signed the

Treaty of Waitangi on 6 February 1840. Over the following months, many other chiefs signed, bringing the total number of signatories to around 500.

As each chief signed, Hobson shook hands, saying, “He iwi tahi tātou” (We are one people), thereby laying down the ideology of assimilation that was to dominate colonial policy well into the twentieth century. Each chief who signed the Treaty was given two blankets and some tobacco.

The English version of the treaty clearly states (Article 1) that the chiefs cede “Sovereignty” to the Queen of England. The Māori translation, however, renders the word “Kawanatanga” – a transliteration of “governance” which had no equivalence in Māori society. Moreover, Article 2 of the Treaty



Maori chief Hone Heke arguing in favour of Māori signing the Treaty of Waitangi

guaranteed the chiefs “undisturbed possession” of their resources in the English version, translated as “tino rangatiratanga” (absolute chieftainship) in Māori. Thus the version of the Treaty that the chiefs signed did not appear to relinquish sovereignty for Māori.

Ranginui Walker argues that while “nominal sovereignty” may have been ceded to the Crown, the chiefs believed they retained “substantive sovereignty” over their lands.

The Treaty was also significant in being

the first official document to refer to tangata whenua as “Māori” (literally: normal, usual or ordinary). Pre-European contact Māori had no single term for themselves; groups were distinguished by their tribal names alone.

Extensive efforts were made to secure more signatures of North Island chiefs, but two paramount chiefs refused to sign, Te Wherowhero (Tainui) and Te Heuheu (Tūwharetoa). Te Heuheu repudiated those who had signed with the words:

I will not agree to the mana of a
strange people being placed over
this land. Though every chief in the
island consent to it, yet I will not.
I will consent neither your act nor
your goods. As for these blankets,
burn them.

Hobson declared the whole of the South Island to be *terra nullius* (“land belonging to no one”), thus dispensing with the need to obtain the consent of Ngāi Tahu.

At the time of the signing of the Treaty, Māori outnumbered Pākehā ten to one. The chiefs who signed could not have envisaged the consequences of colonisation that was to follow. Ranginui Walker commented that: “By their acquiescence in the Treaty, the chiefs opened the way to replicate among their own people the colonial experience of African tribes and the Indians of the

American continent.”

The colonial state almost immediately ignored and neglected the Treaty, but for Māori it was the major point of reference with the state that they returned to again and again. Movements such as the Kingitanga and Kotahitanga appealed to the government by reminding it of its obligations under the Treaty.

Chief Justice Prendergast declared the Treaty to be a “simple nullity” in 1877, but latterly the Crown’s view has shifted significantly. The Fourth Labour Government introduced the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act in 1985, making claims retrospective to 1840, which Walker credits to pressure from the emerging Mana Motuhake. “Consequently, the activist movements suspended resort to direct action, as the tribes moved to avail themselves of the tribunal and other legal avenues”.

The balance of power between the Crown and iwi meant that both the proportion of land returned and the per capita value of settlements have been very low. When Sir Robert Mahuta was asked why Waikato settled for so little he replied “Because we’re tired of being poor.”

There are Māori activists who focus exclusively or excessively on the Treaty. Sections of the Mana Movement are not immune from such “Treatyism”. Such an approach is mistaken, not least because

it's not hard to conceive of a thought experiment in which British imperialism annexed New Zealand through military conquest alone, and without resort to the deception of a treaty (as it did elsewhere). Would this scenario mean that Māori could therefore claim no group rights? Clearly such rights need to derive as much from Māori's status as tangata whenua, as from their enshrinement in the Treaty.

That said, to ignore or downplay the significance of the Treaty (as the WP has done) is ahistorical. We must acknowledge that the Treaty has been, and continues to be, a point of resistance between Māori and the Crown.

What I think the WP has failed to grasp is that there are two Treaties. There is the Treaty, a fraud perpetrated by British imperialism designed to achieve colonisation on the cheap; and Te Tiriti, a contract in which Māori agreed to the settlement of tau iwi, but did not renounce their sovereignty. It is the latter treaty from which TR activists derive their radical subjectivity. Perhaps some of that outlook is utopian and backward-looking, like the hankering for a Saxon golden age by English nationalists who denounced the "Norman yoke" in the 17th century. But I don't think it is entirely.

The Foreshore and Seabed

In 1997 a confederation of tribes from the northern part of the South Island, Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka, applied to the Māori Land Court to determine whether their customary rights to the foreshore and seabed remained extant. The confederation was concerned about the impact of aquaculture on their customary fishing rights, and was frustrated at being shut out of the marine farming industry by Marlborough District Council.

Judge Hingston reached the conclusion from the case that, in the absence of evidence of express extinguishment, customary title to the foreshore remained extant. In 2001 the Attorney-General appealed this ruling. Te Tau Ihu o Te Waka appealed to the High Court in 2003. Chief Justice Sian Elias concluded that the Māori Land Court had the jurisdiction to determine the status of the foreshore and seabed. The response of the opposition National Party was to polarise the issue along racial lines, stoking up fears of Pākehā being denied access to the beach.

In January 2004, Don Brash delivered a speech to Orewa Rotary Club denouncing alleged Māori privilege. He asserted that "The Treaty of Waitangi should not be used as the basis for giving greater civil, political or democratic



The infamous National Party 'Iwi Kiwi' billboards

rights to any particular ethnic group.”The reaction of the Labour-led government was to pass the Foreshore and Seabed Act in November 2004, which deemed the title to be held by the Crown.

My recollection of the WP attitude towards the F&S Act at the time was: (i) that it was no big deal, and (ii) that it was probably better for the foreshore to remain in “public” hands, than to be controlled by what may be undemocratic iwi. On the first point, we missed the boat on how important (even if only symbolically) the issue was to Māori. On the second point, reading the Act as being “nationalisation” of the foreshore was way wide of the mark for several reasons.

Firstly, nationalisation is not always progressive. There is perhaps some

parallel here with the “orthodox” Trotskyists who accommodated to the the Stalinist states by making a fetish of their “progressive nationalised property”. James Connolly’s comment is apposite on this point:

[S]tate ownership and control is not necessarily Socialism – if it were, then the Army, the Navy, the Police, the Judges, the Gaolers, the Informers, and the Hangmen, all would all be Socialist functionaries, as they are State officials – but the ownership by the State of all the land and materials for labour, combined with the co-operative control by the workers of such land and materials, would be Socialism. [...] To the cry of the middle class



The extremes to which elements of the right reacted to the question of the Foreshore and Seabed Act is shown by the way in which they equated John Key as pandering to Māori

reformers, “make this or that the property of the government,” we reply, “yes, in proportion as the workers are ready to make the government their property.”

Secondly, there is the historic relationship of land alienation between Māori and the Crown. Often, “it was the state that took their land, not individual settlers” (Binney, 2009). And finally, there was a racist double standard within the law, in that it extinguished Māori customary rights, but did not expropriate any of the roughly 30% of coastline under private ownership (mostly in the hands of rich

Pākehā).

Annette Sykes described the Act as “the largest confiscation of land since the early colonial period.” The WP did not engage with the spontaneous movement of the June 2004 hikoi. It was during this ferment that the Māori Party was launched, as a split from Labour. Pita Sharples set the tone by declaring the party to be “neither left nor right”.

The National-led government repealed the F&S Act as part of its coalition deal with the Māori Party. It was replaced with the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 which

allowed Māori the right to make claims for protected custody rights, but based on the extraordinarily high threshold of proof showing customary use dating back to 1840. The consequence of these laws today, says Sykes, is that “the government is licensing transnational companies like Petrobras to mine the petroleum and other mineral deposits which subsist in the continental shelf.”

Tino Rangatiratanga

Donna Awatere’s *Māori Sovereignty*, based on articles published between 1982-3, is regarded as the sourcebook of the modern TR movement. Awatere advanced the bleak thesis that all white people were captives of their “own” culture, that “white society” could not be changed, and that Māori should instead seek their liberation through “withdrawal and exodus.” Potentially progressive allies were written off as hopelessly conservative (trade unions) or mired in splits caused by “individualism” (the Left). Even Pacific Islanders were dismissed as having formed an uneasy alliance with Pākehā against Māori Sovereignty.

Today, parts of the polemic are obviously very dated (such as Awatere’s assertion that there is no New Zealand identity independent of British colonialism). However, many of the heavily essentialist notions she presents have since become

widely accepted, albeit in a watered-down form. There is a radical gloss to the thesis, drawing on Gramsci. She accuses the trade union and left-wing movement of possessing a corporate class consciousness based on “inward looking selfishness”, which she counterposes to the opportunity to create a hegemonic class consciousness based on Māoritanga.

Arguing from a Marxist perspective, Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith commented:

Awatere’s account of the Pākehā left had such a powerful political impact precisely because it highlighted many of the inherent weaknesses and real shortcomings of the ideas that existed on the left. Unfortunately, however, it often prevented through its very rhetoric and posturing the possibility of building a mass movement that represented a real challenge to racism and the state because its emphasis on autonomy in struggle resulted theoretically at least, in the exclusion of Pākehā, whatever their social class and gender, from playing a key role in fighting for Māori liberation.

Ranginui Walker has written a historical account of the struggle for Māori liberation from the perspective of cultural nationalism. Attempting to explain recurring divisions within Māori



Annette Sykes

movements, Walker states that “although Māori radicals are the cutting edge of social change, the conservatives are the slow grinding edge.” Poata-Smith, however, describes how class interests

can actually lead to a contradiction of interests of the two. For instance, he describes how conservative elements within the Ngāti Whātua leadership eventually colluded with the government

to end the occupation of Takaparawhau/ Bastion Point, “reveal[ing] that on the one hand the Māori middle class will support certain kinds of struggle so long as it advances their interests but their endorsement of militancy is sharply curtailed if the protest actions threaten their own position or the system itself.”

Poata-Smith further notes how the frequent denunciation of such leaders as “sell out”, “kupapa” (traitor), or “house nigger” by radicals, fails to explain their social role. Far from lacking cultural fortitude, “this group of Māori are perfectly conscious of their own interests. The problem is, however, that their material interests are not the same as those for working class Māori.”

Poata-Smith identifies how the interpretation of TR has been transformed a number of times:

In the period from the early 1970s onwards, four interconnected interpretations were to emerge: tino rangatiratanga as Māori capitalism (in tribal or individual form), tino rangatiratanga as Māori electoral power (primarily through the orthodox parliamentary system), tino rangatiratanga as cultural nationalism, and tino rangatiratanga as involving more radical far-reaching strategies for change.

The degeneration of elements of the TR movement has been latterly analysed by Sykes, who identified her own previous complicity with “the rise of a Māori elite with the process of litigating, negotiating and then implementing Treaty settlements, many of whom have become active sycophants of the broader neo liberal agenda which transfers a limited subset of publicly owned assets and resources into the private ownership of corporations to settle the injustices that have been inflicted upon hapū and iwi Māori.”

Along with the rise of the corporate warriors, Poata-Smith also identifies the collapse of Stalinism as politically disarming groups such as the Communist Party (CPNZ) and SUP (Socialist Unity Party), who were unable to effectively oppose the generalised retreat from class and socialism.

Sykes, whose background is in left-wing cultural nationalism, has to a large extent converged with the Marxist analysis of the trajectory of the TR movement. But idea of the Ao Māori/ Ao Pākehā world view is still widely accepted within Mana. Poata-Smith contends, “Given that identities are blurred, multiple and historically contingent the idea that the main division in society is between Māori and Pākehā also risks fragmentation of the movement itself because it inevitably leads to confusion and fights over authenticity.”

Elizabeth Rata's take on TR is worth examining, especially since Phil Ferguson claimed that she was an academic whose views were close to that of the WP's. Rata argues stridently against the constitutional inclusion of any "foundational group rights". She charts the emergence of an elite based on the creation of what she calls "neo-tribes" (to distinguish them from traditional iwi). This is based on a "total rupture" between the pre- and post-colonial periods, due to the traditional redistributive Māori economy being incompatible with accumulative capitalism. Ideologies of culture like neo-traditionalism

(emphasising kin over class) and culturalism (identity is primary) support the new elite.

To this phenomenon, she counterposes the political economy approach, where politics and economics are primary (but "textured" by culture). The group rights alternative, Rata argues, leads to brokerage politics and the formation of a self-interested elite.

I think Rata provides a trenchant critique of the "Brown Table" with her analysis. However, she conflates that tendency with the whole of the TR movement. She ignores the class struggles occurring within iwi and hapū.



Constitutional lawyer Moana Jackson

And her motivation for opposing group rights is that: “The structural cohesion of the nation-state itself will be destabilised by altering the meaning and practice of citizenship.” Well, we want to smash the state!

Rata also overemphasises the historical rupture of colonisation. Whist most Māori today may be urbanised, proletarianised and detribalised, many still retain strong links to their “bones”, their ancestral lands and traditions. The victory of capitalism is not as complete as Rata makes out.

To Poata-Smith’s list, we may add a fifth interpretation of TR: self-determination in legal processes. Moana Jackson writes of the “criminality of imposed law” of colonisation and repudiates the idea that “in Aotearoa Māori people were held to have no law, and therefore no authority, because the early settlers could not discern in Māori society the things they identified as ‘legal’ – the courts, the police, the written reports.” Traditional society had to be suppressed “in order that the monist idea of ‘one [English] law for all’ could be imposed.

Jackson exposes criminal law as largely ideological, and contrary to the liberal view, is subject to political power and cultural bias. Interestingly, Rua Kennena flew a flag with the slogan “Kotahi Te Ture/ Mo Nga Iwi E Rua/ Maungapohatu” (One Law/ For Both

Peoples/ Maungapohatu), which was seized as evidence for his trial for sedition in 1916. Today the phrase “one law for all” is used by the likes of Don Brash demagogically and hypocritically (since in reality, Brash supports class law, not “one law”). “The key in the phrase ‘one law for all’”, writes Jackson, “is not the process but the result at the end, and the result must be justice for all.”

What I find problematic in Jackson are not his alternatives to the current legal system (a focus on rehabilitation/ restorative justice and community – rather than just individual – responsibility), but rather, his slippage into relativism: “The French have their way of getting justice, the Americans have their way of getting justice, so the Māori people have their way of getting justice, and that is as valid as any other.” My concern is that this approach may inadvertently open the door to reactionary measures, like the introduction of *shari`a* courts to try Muslims.

As this brief survey shows, TR is a heavily contested term, and to reject it wholesale seems to me dogmatic and class reductionist. Perhaps we can say, as Socialist Aotearoa do, that TR is impossible to realise without overthrowing capitalism. In any case, it is the task of socialists in the Mana Movement to help redefine and transform TR into a revolutionary cause.

Sources

Awatere, D. (1984) "Māori Sovereignty", *Broadsheet*.

Binney, Judith. (2009) *Encircled Lands*. Bridget Williams Books.

Connolly, J. (1899) "State Monopoly versus Socialism," *Workers' Republic*, 10 June 1899

Jackson, M. (1991) "Māori Access to Justice," *Race Gender and Class*

Jackson, M. (1995) "Justice and political power: Reasserting Māori legal processes" in Hazlehurst, K.M. (ed.) *Legal pluralism and the colonial legacy: indigenous experiences of justice in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand*, Avebury

Kawharu, I.H. (2001) "Land and Indentity in Tamaki: A Ngati Whatua Per-

spective". Hilary Lecture, Auckland War Memorial Museum Māori Court.

Kyriazopoulos, M. (2010) "Book Review: Encircled Lands: Te Urewera, 1820 – 1921," *Fightback*, September 2010

Nunes, R. (1991) "The Māori in Prehistory and Today," *Workers' Party of New Zealand*

Sykes, A. (2010) "The Politics of the Brown Table," Bruce Jesson Lecture

Poata-Smith, E.S. Te Ahu (2001) "The Political Economy of Māori Protest Politics 1968-1995". PhD Thesis, University of Otago

Poata-Smith, E.S. Te Ahu (2005) http://www.pjreview.info/issues/docs/11_1/pjr11105review_strugg_p211-217.pdf

Walker, R. (2004) *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End*, Penguin

Tino Rangatiratanga – What’s it got to do with Pākehā?

Talk by Grant Brookes, first presented 7 April 2014 – No.4 in Fightback’s weekly “Introduction to Marxism” series.

Perhaps more than the first three topics in Fightback’s “Introduction to Marxism” series, this one is loaded with questions.

Most people probably had some idea about why a socialist group like Fightback supports trade unions, for instance, or what capitalism and socialism are. But what has Tino Rangatiratanga got to do with Pākehā? Nothing? Something? What? It’s a bit less obvious.

For this reason, I’d like to start a discussion on this topic through an FAQ format, with an initial set of questions and some answers. After this, people may feel free to open up with their own questions, and their own answers.

Question 1: What exactly is Tino Rangatiratanga?

Before I answer this question, I’d like to point out the obvious. We are conversing today almost exclusively in English, i Te Reo Pākehā. This is a conscious decision on my part, to enable communication with you.

But as well as enabling communication,

this choice also impairs communication. Meaning is always lost in translation. I’ll come back to this point later. But for now, we will discuss Tino Rangatiratanga in English.

“Rangatira” is usually translated into English as “chief”, or head of a tribe. Rangatiratanga is said to be the quality of being a chief. The term “rangatiratanga” appears in writing in the 1835 Declaration by the United Tribes of New Zealand, where it is normally translated to mean “sovereign independence”.

Tino is an intensifier. “Tino Rangatiratanga”, as “absolute chieftainship”, or “unconditional sovereignty”, appears in the document signed at Waitangi in 1840.

It is now fairly well known that there are two versions of that document, one in English and one in Māori, and that The Treaty of Waitangi and Te Tiriti o Waitangi are not exactly the same. “Tino Rangatiratanga” is mentioned in article two of the Māori version. Translated into English, that part of Te Tiriti says: “The Queen of England agrees to protect the Chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their tino rangatiratanga (or absolute chieftainship) over their lands,

villages and all their treasures”.

In the Māori world, Te Ao Māori, the meaning of “absolute chieftainship over treasures” is made clear through lived experience. Rangatiratanga, for example, would be represented by a known person. Stories, waiata and proverbs, passed down from the ancestors, also carry meaning of rangatiratanga. Meaning is further sustained within Te Reo Māori by the association of this word with others, such as “mana”, “ihi”, “tapu” and “ariki”. Likewise, the meaning of “treasures” is clear though the things which are spoken of as tāonga.

Professor Sir Hugh Kawhuru of the Waitangi Tribunal has observed that “chieftainship... has to be understood in the context of Māori social and political organisation as at 1840”. In particular, this was a world where the idea that land, villages and tāonga were saleable commodities with a monetary value for individual owners was simply inconceivable. “The accepted approximation today”, he says, “is ‘trusteeship’.”

As a living kaupapa, the contemporary meaning of Tino Rangatiratanga has also been shaped by the Māori activists and thinkers who have been part of the revival of struggle which started in the late 1960s, through organisations like *Te Hōkioi*, the Maori Organisation on Human Rights and Ngā Tamatoa.

In 1971, *Te Hōkioi* described the resurgent Māori struggles as “movements of Maori rights to run Maori affairs”. The following year, Ngā Tamatoa staged a Tent Embassy protest at Parliament, calling for “Maori control of Maori things”.

These groups added new layers of meaning to the understanding of Tino Rangatiratanga, as they connected their struggles with others. According to Ranginui Walker, *Te Hōkioi* “aligned the Maori struggle against oppression with the ideology of the class struggle”. Another academic, Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith, has commented: “members of Tamatoa were influenced by the revolutionary wing of the Black Power movement in the United States”.

More recently, Maria Bargh has highlighted a connection with decolonisation and national independence movements on the world stage: “Tino Rangatiratanga is often understood as a translation for the term ‘self-determination’”, she says. “According to Māori understandings, Tino Rangatiratanga has particular connotations and rules attached to it, relating to mana whenua, mana moana, mana tangata and Te Tiriti. Self-determination also has specific rules attached to it, particularly in the framework of the United Nations.”

Margaret Mutu adds that rangatiratanga



Donna Awatere Huata's "Maori Sovereignty" featured in the October 1982 issue of *Broadsheet* (a long-running feminist magazine)

is "high-order leadership, the ability to keep the people together, that is an essential quality in a rangatira. The exercise of such leadership in order to maintain and enhance the mana of the people is rangatiratanga."

Ani Mikaere comments that the origin of the word rangatira "provides a clear indication that Māori leadership has

nothing to do with the assertion of power by one (or some) over others. With 'ranga' coming from the word 'raranga' which means 'to weave' and 'tira' referring to a group, it is apparent that the task of the rangatira is literally to weave the people together."

And as Moana Jackson points out, this leadership through weaving people together is also about power: "John Rangihau used to say that the power vested in tino rangatiratanga was people bestowed. The people could grant it, and the people could take it away in the most fundamental sense. That seems to me to be the essence of democracy defined in Maori terms."

Finally, a very influential statement of Tino Rangatiratanga, as sovereignty, was developed by Donna Awatere in the early 1980s. "Maori sovereignty", she said, "is the Maori ability to determine our own destiny and to do so from the basis of our lands and fisheries. In essence, Maori sovereignty seeks nothing less than the acknowledgement that New Zealand is Maori land, and further seeks the return of this land."

Question 2: Why would Pākehā support the Struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga?

So if the pursuit of Tino Rangatiratanga is above all a struggle by Māori, for Māori, what’s it got to do with Pākehā? Why would Pākehā support, or even join the struggle?

One answer goes something like this: “I think it’s truly dreadful what happened to the Māoris during colonisation. It’s only right that we do what we can to help our less fortunate friends.”

As we start to unpack the meaning of this answer, it is important to acknowledge that it contains an essential truth. What happened to Māori during the 19th and 20th centuries is “dreadful”.

Between 1840 and 1890, Māori lost control of 95 percent of their land, taken largely through force and fraud. To accomplish this dispossession, colonisation involved the forcible suppression of tikanga and Te Reo Māori, wounding the wairua of the people. The population was devastated by war, economic destruction and European diseases, falling from around 100,000 in 1800 to 40,000 a century later. This can only be called genocide.

But unpacking this answer further, we start to strike problems.

Colonisation is not just something that “happened”, in the past. It is still happening today. Confiscation of tāonga continues – not only in the well-known recent cases of the foreshore and seabed or water rights. This year, the government has attempted to forcibly acquire ancestral lands of Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai, currently occupied by novelist Patricia Grace, for the Kāpiti Expressway. And colonisation is reflected daily in Māori imprisonment rates six times higher than others, twice as much child poverty and unemployment, lifespans 10 percent shorter, and a median income 20 percent lower than the general population.

This answer for why Pākehā would want to support the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga is also a moral argument, about the “right” thing to do. It appeals to guilt, which is not the strongest of motivations.

It’s also based on the assumption that “we” (Pākehā) are “fortunate”. It is true that Pākehā, on average, are more fortunate and have benefitted from colonisation.

But this average conceals how the benefits have been distributed very unevenly.

By 1890, over 80 percent of the land in New Zealand was in European hands. But of that, more than 60% of the freehold acres were held by just 600



individuals or companies. Today, the wealth which has been generated from the land and natural resources taken from Māori is largely in the hands of the top 1 percent. They now own more than three times as much as the poorer half of the population put together. The poorer half includes many Pākehā, as well as most Māori. An argument to support Tino Rangatiratanga based on the assumption that Pākehā are “fortunate” is unlikely to convince many of these struggling people.

This reason to support Tino Rangatiratanga also tends to assign Pākehā to a particular role in the struggle – namely, cheering Māori from the sidelines and educating fellow Pākehā about colonisation. This is valuable work, as far as it goes, but it’s also limited.

And finally, it subtly insinuates that Pākehā support is conditional upon Māori remaining “our friends”. What happens if, and when, Māori target “fortunate”, affluent whites in their struggle for liberation?

So in summary, it should be seen by now that this answer for why Pākehā would want to support Tino Rangatiratanga – while containing some important truths – is essentially an answer provided by, and for, the liberal middle class.

But there are other reasons why Pākehā New Zealanders of European descent, or tau iwi from non-European ethnic groups, get involved. Some do so on the basis of their own experience of colonisation and racism.

Unite Union leader Joe Carolan has explained why he joined the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga:

“I first came to Aotearoa [from Ireland] a few days before the Battle of Seattle in November 1999... Less than three months later... I had the first of many korero with Māori comrades about the similarities of the Irish and Māori struggles for freedom and liberation... Irish and Māori have long histories of resistance to draw from, and that is why I am proud to be a member of Mana – a party of struggle, a party of the working class, a party that fights for true Tino Rangatiratanga – self government and independence for us all.”

Mengzhu Fu meanwhile has given a New Zealand Chinese perspective, as a member of Young Asian Feminists Aotearoa:

“While many of us have certain privileges as settlers here, racism and xenophobia can make it hard to access appropriate housing and employment, and allows the mainstream to treat us as secondary citizens... There are different kinds of racisms that are specific to each of our different ethnicities... Migrants of colour and Māori get pitted against each other... [But] there are tau iwi people of colour supporting Tino Rangatiratanga despite the barriers... We were there on the hikoī against the Foreshore and Seabed Bill, we were there in solidarity when the anti-terror raids happened on October 15th 2007... supported the protests against the deletion of Māori seats in the creation of the supercity, marched against asset sales despite the xenophobia and fears of foreign (i.e. Chinese) ownership as if land in this country isn’t already in non-Māori ownership. Beyond having a common oppressor, I think it’s important for tau iwi people of colour... to tautoko the movement



Friedrich Engels argued for Socialism

for Tino Rangatiratanga and mana motuhake from our own cultural frameworks. By... seeing through the divide and rule tactics of the colonial settler system, as tau iwi people of colour, we can seek strategies to disrupt and resist settler colonialism, because there can be no justice for anyone on stolen land, including migrants, without achieving Tino Rangatiratanga and mana motuhake for tangata whenua.”

As a socialist and member of Fightback, I support these reasons and add some more. In our statement of what Fightback is about, we say:

“Under our current system, democracy consists of a vote every 3 years. Most of our lives are lived under dictatorship, the dictatorship of bosses and WINZ case managers. Fightback stands for a system in which our workplaces, our schools, our universities are run democratically, for social need rather than private profit. Fightback participates in the MANA Movement, whose stated mission is to bring ‘rangatiratanga to the poor, the powerless and the dispossessed.’ Capitalism was imposed in Aotearoa through colonisation, and the fight for

indigenous self-determination is intimately connected with the fight for an egalitarian society. We also maintain an independent Marxist organisation outside of parliament, to offer a vision of a world beyond the parliamentary capitalist system... Fightback stands for struggle, solidarity and socialism."

As a Pākehā socialist, therefore, my involvement in the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga is based on what I am against, and what I am for.

I am against capitalism and the destruction it is wreaking on people and our ecology. To effectively work against this requires unity across ethnic divisions, and that means supporting each other's struggles.

This is more than a pious principle. Time and again, it has proved to be a practical necessity. Analysing the workers' movement for an 8 hour day in the United States, Karl Marx observed, "every independent movement of the workers was paralysed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the Republic. Labour cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the black it is branded. But out of the death of slavery a new life at once arose. The first fruit of the Civil War was the eight hours' agitation."

Or as Hone Harawira has put it, paraphrasing the slogan of the American



Liberal prime minister Dick Seddon saw "communism" at Parihaka and vowed to destroy it.

Civil Rights Movement: “no-one is free until everyone is free”.

Marx and Engels also explained that “the emancipation of the working class must be the act of the working class itself”. Despite the unquestioned assumptions of many Pākehā leftists, the working classes of the world are mostly non-European. The emancipation struggles of indigenous people should not only be seen as part of our struggle against capitalism, it should also be recognised that in many places (including Aotearoa) they are leading the struggle for people and planet. As Noam Chomsky pointed out last year: “There is resistance: in Canada it’s coming from First Nations. But it’s worth remembering that that’s a world-wide phenomenon. Throughout the world, the indigenous populations are in the lead.”

As well as being against capitalism, as a member of Fightback I am also for socialism.

What might this “socialism” mean in Aotearoa in the 21st century? Here are a couple of suggestions.

In 1880, Friedrich Engels explained it as follows:

“The proletariat seizes the public power, and by means of this transforms the socialized means of production, slipping from the hands of the bourgeoisie, into public

property. By this act, the proletariat frees the means of production from the character of capital... Socialized production upon a predetermined plan becomes henceforth possible. The development of production makes the existence of different classes of society thenceforth an anachronism... [T]he political authority of the State dies out. Man, at last... becomes... his own master — free... This is the task of the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement, scientific Socialism.”

Based on the earlier discussion, meanwhile, we could sum up the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga, as expressed in Te Tiriti, as “weaving together the people” in a collective struggle for “the essence of democracy”, to reassert “trusteeship” over commonly-owned resources and treasures “to maintain and enhance the mana [power] of the people”.

Now I ask you – which one of these two describes the indigenous socialism that we are fighting for?

To some Pākehā leftists, this would be a ridiculous question. They could not imagine that Māori might come up with an advanced political philosophy, like socialism, aiming at complete social and economic transformation for all. Their blinkered vision leads them to reject



The 1975 Māori land marchers cross Auckland harbour bridge

Tino Rangatiratanga, using words like “separatism” and “reverse racism”.

Yet Pākehā politicians of the 19th century saw it differently. Liberal prime minister Dick Seddon saw “communism” at Parihaka and vowed to destroy it. The first Minister of Native Affairs, Christopher Richmond, defended the march to war in 1860 because it was “putting an end to the state of beastly communism in which the natives were

living”.

And when you look at it without prejudice, a democratic struggle for trusteeship over commonly-owned resources to enhance people power certainly sounds like socialism – even more so in the mind of activist Teanau Tuiono:

“Tino Rangatiratanga should be a radically democratic alternative to

capitalism in which the flaxroots, local community would be constantly and actively involved in making the key decisions about the allocation of society's resources in a collective, co-operative and open manner rather than behind the closed boardroom doors of large corporations (be they tribal or otherwise). It would involve communities making these important decisions and running the economy and society as a whole on a day-to-day basis. Tino Rangatiratanga should embrace a system in which our entire economy is geared up to satisfy the needs of human beings – our tikanga, cultural values and aspirations – not the profit margins of a tiny elite. (i.e. human need, not greed!) It would encapsulate our role as kaitiaki, guardians of the earth and the eco-system. It would be based on a vision of society free of racism, class exploitation, women's oppression, homophobia and the oppression of indigenous peoples.”

And yet, as Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith points out, “agreement on the vision of Tino Rangatiratanga is far from unanimous. It can simultaneously be

identified with Māori capitalism, Māori electoral power, cultural nationalism or revolutionary activity.”

So at present, Tino Rangatiratanga cannot be identified with the socialism we are fighting for.

Engels, meanwhile, is still revered as an authority on socialism. But I don't think his account is the socialism we're fighting for in Aotearoa today, either. This is because, as Karl Marx pointed out, “the working class... have no ready-made utopias to introduce... They have no ideals to realize, but to set free the elements of the new society with which old collapsing bourgeois society itself is pregnant.”

The “elements of the new society” which were present for Engels in England in 1880 are different from those present in Aotearoa today.

Our own indigenous socialism is yet to be developed. What I think we can say, however, is that any new socialist society in Aotearoa will be born out of the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga.

Other Pākehā socialists agree. As Dougal McNeill of the International Socialist Organisation puts it: “Throughout the history of capitalism on these islands the two struggles – for Māori rights and for the working class more generally – have



In her book *Maori Sovereignty*, Donna Awatere questioned whether “alliances” and “unity” with Pākehā are possible

been intimately interconnected... In a country founded on land dispossession and theft, it’s impossible to imagine a socialism that doesn’t champion Tino

Rangatiratanga.”

These are the reasons why I seek to participate in that struggle.



Radical Pākehā activists considered active support for the occupation of Bastion Point to be an important political position

Question 3: Why would Māori allow Pākehā to participate in the Struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga?

As a Pākehā, I won't attempt to answer this question.

But what I can do is report what Māori activists have said about it over the years. It is important to recognise that there is no universally agreed answer on why – or whether – Māori might want Pākehā participation.

Māori activist groups like *Te Hokioi* and the Māori Organisation on Human Rights consciously sought to involve

Pākehā in their struggle. According to Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith, “A close working relationship was forged between Pākehā anti-racist groups and what eventually evolved into the Māori protest movements of the late 1960s”.

In 1975, the historic Land March to Parliament built on this relationship. The organising group, *Te Rōpū Matakite*, took out newspaper advertisements appealing for Pākehā support. These advertisements explained why they wanted Pākehā involvement: “We see no difference between the aspirations of Maori people and the desire of workers in their struggles. We seek the support



Fightback members (including Mike Kyriazopolous on the right) at the MANA AGM in 2012

of workers and organisations, as the only viable bodies which have sympathy and understanding of the Maori people and their desires. The people who are oppressing the workers are the same who are exploiting the Maori today.”

Whina Cooper, as a leader of the March, wrote to trade unions asking for their active participation: “We call on all

members of the working class to support us by marching with us through your areas”. Her letter explained that, “as there is a need for buses for our elders and children, food and accommodation, first aid etc, along the road, we would be very grateful for your financial support also”.

Yet other Māori voices for Tino

Rangitiratanga have cast doubt on this view. Ranginui Walker, for instance, argued that “because race conflict was a primary element... it is not of the same order as class conflict. The cleavage is more fundamental... Proletarianisation of the Maori by expropriation of their resources did not necessarily... make the Maori natural allies of the working class”.

Donna Awatere went further. Her book, *Maori Sovereignty* questioned whether “alliances” and “unity” with Pākehā are even possible in the struggle.

On the one hand, she wrote: “These alliances are necessary because changes cannot occur with the Maori on our own”.

But on the other hand:

“White people deny that they are aligned together. White women cite their differences with white men, homosexual from heterosexual, the working class from the capitalist class. Yet... All white people share in the benefits of the alienation of Maori land, in the imposition of European cultural values of individualism, materialism, in the imposition of their concepts of spirituality and in the imposition of the English language...

The first loyalty of white women is

always to the White Culture and the White Way. This is true as much for those who define themselves as feminists as for any other white woman... white workers, while they are in one way opposed to the boss class, are in another way locked tight with the boss in racial hegemony. This is the crux of it; whites stick together, whatever their class... Left wing groups aim to harness the revolutionary potential of the working classes to... put aside the capitalist classes' power... This, however, will still not assure Maori sovereignty since 'the (white) people' who will replace this power are still as much intruders as the bosses.”

Donna Awatere concluded:

“I've spent a good 16 years snooping around the country looking for alliances. Friends among the 'enemy'. This search has taken me into the feminist movement, the trade unions, around the left and into the Pacific Island communities... These groups will not align themselves with us. All white people are captives of their own culture. And they don't know they're captives. They therefore



English Marxist Shanice McBean

ignore the door of the cage we hold
open for them.”

There is some ambiguity in her book. But many readers of *Maori Sovereignty* concluded that there is no place for Pākehā in the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga.

I might not fully accept all her arguments – for example, that all white people benefit more from the alienation of Maori land than by fighting for a socialist society which recognises Māori

sovereignty, or that European culture is inherently individualistic, regardless of class.

But it is not for me to say that Pākehā are allowed to participate in any struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga when we are not invited.

More recently, however, Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith has given other answers to why Māori would allow Pākehā to participate in the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga:

“Firstly... the perception that the struggle for tino rangatiratanga is primarily a Maori versus Pakeha struggle forces Maori to struggle against the entire Pakeha population. In essence this isolates the Maori struggle forcing it to rely entirely on its own resources. Given the fact that these resources are meagre, the struggle is very unequal to say the least.

Secondly, movements consisting of Maori alone have no real social power to fundamentally transform their oppression. Historical evidence shows that political movements based solely on the ‘identity’ of the participant tend to lurch from left to right of the political spectrum precisely because they have no real means to achieve their political aims...

Any fight against Maori oppression must be based upon building the strongest possible liberation movement by uniting different oppressed groups into a common struggle. This is essential because true liberation for Maori will not occur without a fundamental transformation of capitalist society and the creation of a classless society in which there is real women’s liberation, gay and

lesbian liberation, and freedom from racism. It is not necessary to actually experience a particular form of oppression in order to fight against it, any more than it is necessary to be destitute in order to fight poverty (Smith 1994: 4). All those struggling for a better society can learn to recognise and identify with those facing particular oppressions and can be enlisted as common allies in the struggle.”

Today, the MANA Movement has opened the door for Pākehā and other tauīwi to join the struggle. The statement of “Our Principles” in 2011 said:

“The MANA Movement strives for tino rangatiratanga and caring for others so whanau and communities can uplift themselves.

The path to self-determination, physical, social and spiritual wellbeing will require long-term fundamental change. Until that is achieved, the state and the MANA Movement have a responsibility to ensure whanau can live with dignity and live in accordance with te Tiriti o Waitangi.

To achieve this goal, MANA embraces the following principles:

- Tino rangatiratanga – as expressed through He Whakaputanga me Te Tiriti o Waitangi, is the basis of the modern Aotearoa NZ state.
- Social change – MANA will work with anyone to transform our world: to redistribute the wealth, to eliminate poverty, and to guarantee people’s rights to shelter, health, culture, identity and decent livelihoods.
- Kaupapa Maori – those basic principles which guarantee social

justice, economic fairness and physical and spiritual wellbeing, embracing diversity and mutual respect.

- Advocacy – MANA will speak up and where necessary stand up for the poor, the sick, the marginalised, the exploited and the vulnerable.

MANA is a movement of the people, led by the people, and fighting for the people.”



Rosa Parks



Question 4: How should Pākehā engage with the Struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga?

Given that some Māori activists do not see a place for Pākehā in their struggle, we should stop and ask why. Does it have something to do with how we engage?

According to Evan Te Ahu Poata-Smith: “Awatere’s account of the Pākehā left had such a powerful political impact precisely because it highlighted many of the inherent weaknesses and real

shortcomings of the ideas that existed on the left.”

It follows that if Pākehā leftists wish to participate, then we need to address our own collective weaknesses and shortcomings in relation to the Māori struggle. I will conclude with a few ideas on what this might entail.

Firstly, for Pākehā socialists, we can apply the theoretical lessons from the current debates on intersectionality. What does this mean? English socialist Shanice McBean explains it like this:

“Intersectionality says three core things. First: we should fight all manifestations of oppression. Second: the experiences under capitalism of one person differ from that of another person because of one’s place across material lines of oppression and exploitation... third... that one form of oppression can be shaped by and can shape other forms of oppression. Racism, for example, can be sexualised, or women’s oppression can be racialised – and this happens in such a way that it becomes impossible to view different oppressions as separate. We already know that all

oppressions are connected by having material roots in capitalism... But intersectionality makes the further claim that... the experiences of oppression can differ depending on who you are.”

An older generation of activists might find here a solution to the problems of the flawed “tripod theory” from the 1980s. Theoretical insights alone, of course, are not enough. We need to engage better on a personal level, as well.

Personally, I believe that Pākehā wanting to participate in the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga should learn Te Reo Māori. In February, my Māori language class at Te Wānanga o Aotearoa received our certificates at a graduation ceremony. Conducted largely in Te Reo Māori, Te Puāwaitanga celebrated “Te Reo me ōna tikanga”. There isn’t a short, easy translation of what this means. But it implies that the right ways of thinking and acting in Te Ao Māori belong – in a specific way – to the language. We certainly need to understand the right ways of thinking and acting, as seen by Māori, if we want to participate in the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga.

Secondly, as the decolonisation movement of the 1980s and 1990s understood, Pākehā need to learn their

own history, learn where we come from, if we want to understand Māori. This reflects the truth of the feminist slogan (used as a title for the Annette Sykes interview in Maria Bargh’s book) that “the personal is political”. And it also reflects the dialectical movement of knowing and accepting who you are, in order to change who you are. We each need to understand how we came to be here, as descendants of colonists, if we want to comprehensively undo colonisation.

Nō reira, tēnei te mihi.

Ko wai āhau?

Ko Cornwall te waka

Nō Koterana ōku tūpuna

I tae atu rātou ki Ōtepoti i te tau 1849

Nō Ōtepoti āhau

**Ko Kapukataumahaka tōku maunga
teitei Ko Owheo tōku awa pāpaku**

Ko Saint Kilda tōku marae

Ko ngā kaimahi ō te Ao tōku iwi

Ko Helen tōku mama

Ko Don tōku papa

Ko Grant Brookes tōku ingoa.

My ancestors first arrived in Dunedin

54 Socialism and Māori Sovereignty

in 1849. They arrived as dissident supporters of the Free Church of Scotland, and became farmers. Through the generations, there was a pattern of my land-owning forbears marrying working class labourers, much to the disapproval of their parents. In 1890, as students of New Zealand history will know, there was a famous Royal Commission into “sweated labour”, in response to union agitation focused on Dunedin.

Two teenage farm workers, known to the historical record only by their initials, gave evidence to the Commission against my farming ancestor, William Sanderson: “We rise in the morning at 3.30, feed the horses, and start milking. There are thirty eight cows to milk, and we milk six each. After receiving the milk into the carts we proceed to Dunedin to deliver it to the customers about 5 o’clock a.m. We breakfast about 4.30, and are only allowed five minutes to take it, being hurried away to the city. After returning we are set to do any jobs about the place until 4.30 p.m, when we resume milking. We take supper about 6.30 p.m, and after feeding the horses

we can go to bed. We generally do so about 8 p.m. We complain of the long hours, and that the wages paid to us are not equivalent. The wages we are paid are 17s. 6d. and 15s. respectively, and found.”

William Sanderson is my great-great-great-grandfather. But I also recognise these two young men as ancestral members of my iwi, Ngā Kaimahi o Te Ao.

As a child, I learned the traditional family names handed down from the early settlers. But our children have received names which reflect my iwi. So my son is Tama Antonio, after the many tāngata whenua bearing this first name all the way back to Te Arawa waka, and after Antonio Gramsci, revolutionary leader of the Italian working class. And my daughter is Rosa Mārama, for enlightenment and in honour of our tūpuna rangatira, Rosa Luxemburg and Rosa Parks. Their surname is different from the one given to me, and different from the one given to their mother. We are undoing colonisation in our family in the hope our children will be equipped for a new society, free from the shackles

of the old.

Lastly, here are a few practical tips of how Pākehā might think and act as we engage in the struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga.

Listen more than you talk. And as you listen, bear in mind the mana tangata of every person – including those who might be considered “political opponents” in Te Ao Pākehā. Respect in particular the mana of your elders, the kaumātua and kuia, and the mana of the rangatira. Some of the things that Pākehā members of the MANA Movement have written about Hone on facebook over the last 2 weeks make me ashamed for them. To whakaiti like that is to betray ignorance of what mana means. The right ways of thinking and acting in Te Ao Māori are more than about having the right ideas, or the evidence, or the arguments. Ask questions, don’t impose answers.

When getting on in Te Ao Pākehā, some say: “It’s who you know, not what you know, that counts”. Others, who seek to

replace the system of class privilege with meritocracy, say: “what you know should matter more than who you know”.

Put aside all these Western ideas. For Māori, what matters is how you relate, and how you are related. Acknowledge shared ancestry – founded on blood ties, yes, but also on the other ties that bind. We are all related to each other, and to every living thing, as descendants of Tāne Mahuta. Bonds of solidarity forged in struggle can pass from generation to generation. Whanaungatanga guides all things.

And appreciate the different understanding of time in Te Ao Māori. The present is not the be-all and end-all. The struggle for Tino Rangatiratanga has been going on long before you arrived, and it will go on without you. Do not expect sudden change here and now. Be patient.

So that’s all from me. The questions and answers are now for you to continue.

Ae Marika! Tribute to Mike Kyriazopoulos.

AE MARIKA is an article written every week by Hone Harawira, leader of the MANA Movement and Member of Parliament for Te Tai Tokerau. This tribute, to Fightback comrade Mike Kyriazopoloulos, was originally published on Mana.net.nz in June 2013.

On Saturday night I was privileged to host my first ever citizenship ceremony as a Member of Parliament. The ceremony was for a good friend of mine, Mike Kyriazopoulos and his wife Joanne. Mike is a mix of Greek and Jewish ancestry, and used to live and work in England where he met his wife Joanne.

Their citizenship application was finally approved a couple of weeks ago, and the ceremony was held at the Auckland Trades Hall in Auckland as part of a special tribute evening for Mike who is a committed socialist, a union activist, and chairman of the MANA branch of Te Raki Paewhenua.

Mike gave his oath of allegiance in Maori and followed that with his own personal

vow to honour Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the principles of international socialism.

The tribute part of the evening was because Mike has motor neurone disease which causes nerve cells to degenerate and muscles to waste away. Sufferers invariably end up unable to walk, speak, use their arms and hands, or hold up their head. It has no known cause and is invariably fatal. Mike is not expected to live much longer.

Tributes flowed in from union activists and socialist comrades from around the world and from the many gathered for the evening, and ended with my wife Hilda getting all these staunch socialists to hold hands and each say something nice about Mike as part of a big karakia for him.

Mike is not a man given to much emotion, and his speech was one urging everyone to have clear purpose and a strong commitment to the future.

A sad occasion but a great celebration nonetheless.

Fightback's Ten-Point Programme

Fightback stands for the following core programme, and for building institutions of grassroots power in the working class and oppressed groups to bring them about:

- 1 Constitutional transformation based on Tino Rangatiratanga, Mana Motuhake and workers power. Tangata whenua and community co-ops to operate as kaitiaki over public resources.
- 2 Secure, appropriate and meaningful work for those who want it, with a shorter working week. Benefit system to be replaced with a Universal Basic Income.
- 3 International working class solidarity. Open borders, full rights for migrant workers. Recognition of Pasefika rights to self-determination. Opposition to all imperialist intervention and alliances, including New Zealand state's participation in military occupations, 'free trade' agreements and surveillance agreements.
- 4 No revolution without women's liberation. Full funding for appropriate, community-driven abuse prevention and survivor support, free access to all reproductive technologies, public responsibility for childcare and other reproductive work. The right to full, safe expression of sexuality and gender identity.
- 5 An ecosocialist solution to climate change. End fossil fuel extraction, expand green technology and public transport, and radically restructure industrial food production.
- 6 Freedom of information. End corporate copyright policies in favour of creative commons. Public support for all media technologies, expansion of affordable broadband internet to the whole country. An end to government spying.
- 7 Abolish prisons, replace with restorative justice and rehabilitation.
- 8 Universal right to housing. Expansion of high-density, high-quality public housing, strict price controls on privately owned houses. Targeted support to end involuntary homelessness.
- 9 Fully-funded healthcare at every level. Move towards health system based on informed consent, remove inequities in accident compensation, opposition to "top-down" efforts to change working people's behaviour.
- 10 Fully-funded education at every level, run by staff and students. Funding for all forms of education and research, enshrining kaupapa Maori approaches.

www.fightback.org.nz

Fightback website is where you'll find interesting commentary on a daily basis, and in-depth articles posted several times a week.

Also on Facebook at: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/145302158630>

Local Fightback Contacts:

Auckland

Daphne
027 220-9552
daphne@randomstatic.net
PO Box 10 282 Dominion Road

Wellington

Ian
022 385-8682
ian.ndrsn@gmail.com

Fightback:

Magazine of Fightback
Published quarterly

Subscriptions are just:
\$10 for 1 year (4 issues)
or \$20 for 2 years (8 issues).
Overseas subscription rates
available on request.

Deposit subscription
payments to Kiwibank
38-9002-0817250-00
and email details to:
ian.ndrsn@gmail.com

Or write to:
PO Box 10 282
Dominion Road
Auckland
Please make all cheques
payable to Fightback

